

MS APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS  
BEST AVAILABLE COPY

8012-1149

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE  
THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of

Nakayuki YAMAMOTO et al.

Serial No. 08/913,056

Appeal No. 2004-0338

Filed October 22, 1997

(GROUP 1617)

MUCOSAL PREPARATION CONTAINING  
PHYSIOLOGICALLY ACTIVE PEPTIDEREPLY BRIEF

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONORS:

The Examiner's Answer mailed October 16, 2003 on the one hand contends at Item 10 that the rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 USC §103 is as set forth in the prior Office Action, Paper No. 3; however, on the other hand, the Examiner's Answer goes on to state that "Majeti is withdrawn from the rejection."

Thus, it is by definition a yet still further new ground of rejection that is now applied for the first time in the Examiner's Answer of October 16, 2003, in violation of the requirement that any such new ground of rejection would require reopening prosecution.

Nevertheless, as appellants would in any event request once again to reinstate the appeal in response to a further reopening of prosecution, we put aside the procedural impropriety of the Examiner's approach for the sake of

Reply Brief dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Examiner's Answer of October 16, 2003

Docket No. 8012-1149

achieving the overdue resolution of this appeal on the merits.

In continuing to seek to defend the now-reformulated rejection of claims 1-27 under 35 USC §103, based on a combination of references that was initially seven in number, and which then swelled to 13, and which now has contracted to 12, the Examiner persists in the untenable position that the mention of saliva and mucoid secretions in MASIZ, among a list of various other bodily fluids capable of breaking apart the disclosed MULE complex, means that transmucosal delivery is taught by the reference.

By the same rationale, the disclosure of blood as the first bodily fluid in the list appearing at column 5, lines 25-28 would constitute a teaching of administering the MASIZ transdermal complex by subcutaneous injection; the mention of intracranial fluid in that same passage would constitute a teaching of surgically implanting the transdermal complex in the brain, and the mention of cerebral spinal fluid would constitute a teaching of injecting the transdermal complex at the base of the skull.

This is believed to underscore wherein the Examiner's reading of the reference is altogether untenable, entirely inconsistent with how that disclosure would be viewed by one skilled in the art, and wholly unworthy of adoption by the Board, especially in view of the repeated and emphatic disclosure in MASIZ of a solely transdermal transport system.

Of course, the significance of this aspect of MASIZ, is that it destroys any motivation to replace the irritant vasodilators of the primary reference, which are chosen for transdermal use, with suitable vasodilators for transmucosal administration such as those exemplified in the secondary reference to ROBERTS, as discussed more fully in Appellants' brief filed April 28, 2003.

The Examiner's summary discussion of the second obviousness rejection, which was applied only to claims 1-3, 18, 19 and 21-27, adds no substance to the rejection as applied initially, and Appellants therefore refer to discussion of that rejection in their opening brief.

Item 10 of the Examiner's Answer seems to indicate that the indefiniteness rejection applied to claims 3-17 and 21 is being maintained; however, in the Examiner's Response to Argument section, the indefiniteness rejection is not addressed. It is therefore unclear whether the Examiner maintains that rejection, but, in any event, there is nothing to reply to in the context of the present paper, and Appellants refer instead to their opening brief for their arguments in traverse of that rejection.

The above points are believed to further demonstrate wherein the various rejections of the pending claims 1-27 cannot properly be affirmed, but instead should

8012-1149

PATENTS

IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE BEFORE  
THE BOARD OF PATENT APPEALS AND INTERFERENCES

In re application of  
Nakayuki YAMAMOTO et al.

Serial No. 08/913,056

Appeal No. 2004-0338

Filed October 22, 1997

(GROUP 1617)

MUCOSAL PREPARATION CONTAINING  
PHYSIOLOGICALLY ACTIVE PEPTIDE

REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING

MAY IT PLEASE YOUR HONORS:


It is respectfully requested that an oral hearing  
be set in the above-identified matter, and that we be  
notified of the time and date thereof.

Please charge the oral hearing fee of \$290, to the  
deposit account of the undersigned attorneys of record, No.  
25-0120.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

By

  
Andrew J. Patch

Attorney for Appellants  
Registration No. 32,925  
745 South 23rd Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone: 521-2297

December 15, 2003

Reply Brief dated December 15, 2003

Reply to Examiner's Answer of October 16, 2003

Docket No. 8012-1149

be reversed. Such action is accordingly respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG & THOMPSON

By

*Rolling 41949*  
Andrew J. Patch  
Attorney for Appellants  
Registration No. 32,925  
745 South 23rd Street  
Arlington, VA 22202  
Telephone: 521-2297

AJP/lk

8012-1149

THE STAMP OF THE PATENT OFFICE MAIL HEREON ACKNOWLEDGES THE  
RECEIPT OF THE BELOW-IDENTIFIED DOCUMENT ON THE DATE INDICATED  
BY SUCH STAMP.


In re: Nakayuki YAMAMOTO et al.

Appeal No. 2004-0338

S.N. 08/913,056

Group 1617

REQUEST FOR ORAL HEARING



oral hearing fee CHARGE TO ACCOUNT \$290

AJP/lk

YOUNG & THOMPSON  
745 S. 23<sup>rd</sup> St.  
Arlington, VA 22202

facsimile transmittal

To: Dianne Maggard/Board of Appeals Fax: 703-308-6200

From: Laurie Cobb Date: 1/7/2004

Re: Pages: Cover + 7

CC:

☐ Urgent ☐ For Review ☐ Please Comment ☐ Please Reply ☐ Please Recycle

As per your request, here is a copy of the appeal brief filed on  
12/15/03. We have included a copy of the postcard receipt.

## MS APPEAL BRIEF-PATENTS

8012-1149

THE STAMP OF THE PATENT OFFICE MAIL HEREON ACKNOWLEDGES THE  
RECEIPT OF THE BELOW-IDENTIFIED DOCUMENT ON THE DATE INDICATED  
BY SUCH STAMP.

In re: Nakayuki YAMAMOTO et al.Appeal No. 2004-0338S.N. 08/913,056Group 1617REPLY BRIEF (in triplicate)

AJP/lk

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning  
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

## **BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES**

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- ☐ **BLACK BORDERS**
- ☐ **IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- ☐ **FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- ☐ **SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- ☐ **COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- ☐ **GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- ☐ **LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- ☐ **REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- ☐ **OTHER:** \_\_\_\_\_

**IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.**

**As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.**